

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 15, and 19-21 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 15-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15-17, and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0229670 (hereinafter “Beyda”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,772 (hereinafter “Ahmed”), although they are listed to be rejected in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236763 (hereinafter “Kilduff”). Claims 4 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda, in view of Kilduff and in further view of Official Notice. Claims 5, 6, 13, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable of Beyda, in view of Kilduff, in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056508 (hereinafter “Arneson”). Claims 9, 10, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda, in view of Kilduff, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,318,098 (hereinafter “Steinberg”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-25 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Beyda, Ahmed, Kilduff, Arneson, and Steinberg. Applicants respectfully submit that Beyda, Ahmed, Kilduff, Arneson, and Steinberg, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-25. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-25 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, even if Beyda and Ahmed were combined as alleged, the combination still fails to disclose the mechanism used to determine which action to perform as recited in amended claim 1. The method of amended claim 1 recites, in part, “retrieving the stored state information that is unique to the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier based on the message identifier received in the response message from the device” and “retrieving stored action information corresponding to an action in the one or more actions using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using the at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device.”

As recited in amended claim 1, action information is stored at a computer system that acts as an intermediary for devices that need to access a set of applications to perform the one or more actions. As recited, the action information provides an action identifier identifying each action in the one or more actions and a mapping between the action identifier and information specifying how the computer system interacts with the set of applications to perform the action corresponding to the action identifier. As further recited in amended claim 1, state information is stored at the computer system that is unique to a message to be sent to a device. As recited, the state information provides a message identifier generated by the computer system to uniquely identify the message and a mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier generated by the computer system.

Applicants respectfully submit that Beyda and Ahmed, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “retrieving the stored state information that is unique to the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier based on the message identifier received in the response message from the device” and “retrieving stored action information corresponding to an action in the one or more actions using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using the at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device” as recited in amended claim 1. In regard to the feature recited in amended claim 1 of

“retrieving the stored state information that is unique to the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier based on the message identifier received in the response message from the device,” on page 4, the Office Action recognizes that retrieving stored state information that is unique to a message sent to a device to obtain a mapping associating at least a portion of stored action information with the message identifier as recited in amended claim 1 is missing from Beyda. This is due in part because the Office Action acknowledges that Beyda “fails to explicitly disclose that the message send to the device includes a message identifier used to retrieve the stored information associating the actions and the message.”

In regard to the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “retrieving stored action information corresponding to an action in the one or more actions using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using the at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device.” The Office Action simply concludes that “some sort of identification is almost certainly included.” The Office Action simply concludes that “[s]ome mechanism must be used to determine which actions are associated with the ‘1’ or ‘2’.” Yet, these are simply possibilities indicative of impermissible hindsight by the Examiner. The instant messaging system of Beyda does not provide any explicit sort of identification mechanism for actions or message as recited. In particular, Beyda fails to disclose two types of mappings as recited in amended claim 1, a mapping in action information between an action identifier and information specifying how a computer system interacts with a set of applications to perform an action corresponding to the action identifier and a mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with a message identifier generated by a computer system.

The Office Action relies on conjecture and possibilities rather than factual evidence in alleging that Beyada and Ahmed disclose the feature of “retrieving stored action information corresponding to an action in the one or more actions using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using the at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device” as recited in amended claim 1. Yet, one of ordinary skill could readily understand

middleware 154 to operate without the alleged sort of identification between messages or actions that “is almost certainly included.” For example, in paragraph [0077] of Beyda, Beyda suggests that the notification generated by middleware 154 may prompt the user “to respond in a certain way to indicate the user’s selection.” Middleware 154 may provide or initiate an appropriate or corresponding response to application 152 thereby reasonably suggesting that middleware 154 merely forwards any response received from the user to the application without implementing a mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier generated by the computer system as recited in amended claim 1 because middleware 154 simply prompted the user to respond “in a certain way to indicate the user’s selection.” Thus, middleware 154 may simply forward the response and would reasonably negate the “almost certain requirement” alluded to in the Office Action that some sort of identification be included.

Ahmed further fails to cure the deficiencies of Beyda. The Office Action simply attempts to rely on the alleged teachings of Ahmed where a message identifier is used to identify a reply to an original message. However, the combining of the alleged teachings in Ahmed of using a message identifier to identify a reply message with the teachings of Beyda still fail to remedy the deficiencies of Beyda discussed above. Simply being able to identify an original message does not provide the explicit feature that stored state information is retrieved that is unique to the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier as recited in amended claim 1.

Again, the Office Action simply concludes that “some mechanism must be used” to determine which actions are associated with “1” or “2” as provided in a response. The conclusion falls short though because the Office Action has yet to explain any particular mechanism in either Bedyda or Ahmed that could be used by middleware 154 while Applicants have identified in Beyda indications to the contrary.

The method of amended claim 1 recites, in part, retrieving stored state information that is unique to a message sent to a device using a computer system that acts as an intermediary for devices that need to access a set of applications to obtain a mapping associating at least a portion of action information with a message identifier based on the

message identifier as received in a response message from the device. As recited in amended claim 1, stored action information corresponding to an action in one or more actions is retrieved using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using at least one of one or more action identifiers for actions represented in the message sent to the device. Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged combination of Bedyda and Ahmed fail to disclose or suggest “retrieving the stored state information that is unique to the message sent to the device using the computer system to obtain the mapping associating at least a portion of the action information with the message identifier based on the message identifier received in the response message from the device” and “retrieving stored action information corresponding to an action in the one or more actions using the computer system from the portion of the stored action information associated with the message identifier using the at least one of the one or more action identifiers for the actions represented in the message sent to the device” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 8, 15, and 21 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. For example, amended claim 8 recites “retrieving stored second information from the set of storage devices using the computer system that enables the desired action to be performed by an application based on the mapping between the message identifier and the information identifying the desired action in the one or more actions.” As recited in amended claim 8, a mapping is generated with the computer system between the message identifier and the information identifying the one or more actions performed by applications accessible to the computer system stored as first information. As address above, Beyda and Ahmed fail to disclose that a mapping is generated between the message identifier and the information identifying the one or more actions performed by applications accessible to the computer system stored as first information and the feature “retrieving stored second information from the set of storage devices using the computer system that enables the desired action to be performed by an application based on the mapping between the message identifier and the information identifying the desired action in the one or more actions” as recited in amended claim 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 22-25 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 15-25 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. However, at the request of the Office Action, Applicants have amended the rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/687,219
Amdt. dated July 6, 2009
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2009

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62080469 v1